arXiv:1512.00906v2 [math.NA] 8 Mar 2016

What are Butcher series, really?

The story of rooted trees and numerical methods for evolution equations

Robert I. McLachlan*[1], Klas Modin†[2], Hans Munthe-Kaas‡[3], and Olivier Verdier§[4]

[1]*Institute of Fundamental Sciences, Massey University, New Zealand*
[2]*Mathematical Sciences, Chalmers University of Technology and University of Gothenburg, Sweden*
[3]*Department of Mathematics, University of Bergen, Norway*
[4]*Department of Computing, Mathematics and Physics, Bergen University College, Norway*

2016-03-09

Abstract

Butcher series appear when Runge–Kutta methods for ordinary differential equations are expanded in power series of the step size parameter. They provide an indispensable tool for determining the order of convergence of a method. Each term in a Butcher series consists of a weighted elementary differential, and the set of all such differentials is isomorphic to the set of rooted trees, as noted by Cayley in the mid 19th century. A century later Butcher discovered, remarkably, that rooted trees also can be used to obtain order conditions, and he found a natural group structure, today known as the Butcher group. The set of Runge–Kutta methods is dense in the Butcher group, but it is now known that many other numerical methods also can be expanded in Butcher series; these are called B-series methods. A long-standing problem among numerical analysts has been to characterize, in terms of qualitative features, all B-series methods. Here we tell the story of Butcher series, stretching from the early work of Cayley, to modern developments and connections to abstract algebra, and finally the resolution of the characterization problem. Every B-series method is affine-equivariant, i.e., independent of the choice of affine coordinates, so a suggestion was that affine-equivariance might be a defining property. The recent advances reported on here refute this suggestion and unlocks the solution: B-series methods are those that are equivariant with respect to affine transformations between vector spaces of all possible (finite) dimensions. This characterization of B-series methods opens up an entirely new perspective on a long-studied topic: traditionally it has been explored using analysis and combinatorics; now, geometry has entered.

Keywords: Butcher series, order conditions, numerical integrators, ordinary differential equations, rooted trees, elementary differentials, affine equivariance

MSC2010: 65-03, 01-08, 65L06

1 From Cayley to Butcher

Our title, *What are Butcher series, really?*, is a question about the algebraic and geometric structure of rooted trees and elementary differentials. The story of Butcher series and its

*r.mclachlan@massey.ac.nz
†klas.modin@chalmers.se
‡hans.munthe-kaas@uib.no
§olivier.verdier@hib.no

uses in chemistry, theoretical physics, and applied and pure mathematics is fascinating. We shall relate this story to recent attempts to answer our title question. We begin, however, with the traditional definition.

Butcher series are intimately associated with the set of smooth (infinitely differentiable) vector fields on vector spaces. Indeed, let f be a smooth vector field on a vector space V, defining the ordinary differential equation (ODE)

$$\dot{x} = f(x), \tag{1}$$

where $\dot{x} = \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t}$ denotes the derivative with respect to time t. One way to study (1) is to develop the Taylor series of its solutions. Let $x(h)$ be the solution to (1) at time $t = h$ subject to the initial condition $x(0) = x_0$. The Taylor series of $x(h)$ in h is

$$x(h) = x(0) + h\dot{x}(0) + \frac{1}{2}h^2\ddot{x}(0) + \cdots. \tag{2}$$

We already know that $x(0) = x_0$ and $\dot{x}(0) = f(x_0)$. The additional terms can be found by repeatedly applying the chain and product rule. For example,

$$\ddot{x} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\dot{x} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}f(x) = f'(x)\dot{x} = f'(x)f(x),$$

or, relative to a basis $x = x^1\mathbf{e}_1 + \cdots + x^n\mathbf{e}_n$,

$$\ddot{x}^i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial f^i}{\partial x^j}(x) f^j(x),$$

where $f(x) = f^1(x)\mathbf{e}_1 + \cdots + f^n(x)\mathbf{e}_n$. Continuing in this way gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x} &= f(x),\\
\ddot{x} &= f'(x)f(x),\\
\dddot{x} &= f'(x)f'(x)f(x) + f''(x)(f(x), f(x)),\\
\ddddot{x} &= f'(x)f'(x)f'(x)f(x) + f'(x)f''(x)(f(x), f(x)) +\\
&\qquad 3f''(x)(f'(x)f(x), f(x)) + f'''(x)(f(x), f(x), f(x)),\\
&\vdots
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Here the kth derivative $f^{(k)}(x)$ of the vector field f is regarded as a multilinear map $V^k \to V$; for example, $f''(f, f)$ is the vector field on V whose ith coordinate is

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 f^i}{\partial x_j \partial x_k}(x) f^j(x) f^k(x).$$

A vector field of the form appearing in (3), combining f and its derivatives, is called an *elementary differential*. Now, using (3), the Taylor series (2) for the solution of (1) can be written as

$$x(h) = x_0 + hf + \frac{1}{2}h^2 f'f + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f'f'f + \frac{1}{6}h^3 f''(f, f) + \cdots \tag{4}$$

where each elementary differential is evaluated at x_0. Notice that the power of h in each term is determined by the multiplicity of f in the elementary differential. However, the coefficients 1, 1, 1/2, 1/6, 1/6, and so on are *not* determined by their corresponding

elementary differentials. A *Butcher series*, shortly denoted *B-series*, is a generalization of (4) allowing arbitrary coefficients, i.e., a formal series of the form

$$B(c,f) := c_0 x_0 + c_1 hf + c_2 h^2 f'(f) + c_3 h^3 f'(f'(f)) + c_4 h^3 f''(f,f) + \cdots$$

where $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Although presented here in coordinates, we shall see that Butcher series do not depend on the choice of basis.

Butcher series are named in honour of the New Zealand mathematician John Butcher. In a publication career spanning (so far) 60 years he has written 167 papers and books, all but 18 of them concerned in some way with Runge–Kutta methods and their generalisations. Most of them involve in some way the fundamental structure that bears his name. Butcher series were introduced in a remarkable series of ten sole-authored papers in the years 1963–1972.

A Runge–Kutta method is a numerical approximation $x_n \mapsto x_{n+1}$ of the exact flow of (1) defined by the following equations in x_n, x_{n+1}, $X_1, \ldots, X_\nu \in V$:

$$X_i = x_n + h \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} a_{ij} f(X_j),$$

$$x_{n+1} = x_n + h \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} b_j f(X_j).$$

Here ν is the number of stages of the method and a_{ij}, b_j are real numbers parameterising the Runge–Kutta method. Associated with the abstract Runge–Kutta method (1) are its *order conditions*, polynomials equations in a_{ij} and b_j—one equation per elementary differential—that determine the order of convergence of the method and its local error. Their derivation has been simplified over the years; a modern exposition can be found in Hairer, Lubich and Wanner [17].

The first breakthrough paper dates from 1963 [5]. Here Butcher found for the first time the coefficients c_i of the B-series (1) of x_{n+1} of the Taylor expansion in h of an arbitrary Runge–Kutta method. This gave the order conditions for Runge–Kutta methods in complete generality. As previous studies had laboriously expanded the solutions of particular (e.g., explicit) methods by hand, this was an enormously important development.

Butcher did have, however, some precursors. The most notable example is the paper of Merson [25] from 1957. Robert Henry 'Robin' Merson (1921–1992) was a scientist at the Royal Aircraft Establishment, Farnborough, UK, who was invited along with more senior numerical analysts to a conference on Data Processing and Automatic Computing Machines at Australia's Weapons Research Establishment in Salisbury, South Australia.[1] It seems like a long way to go for a conference in 1957. However, the UK was still performing above-ground atomic bomb tests in South Australia at that time and the Australian government was very keen to be a part of the emerging era. Merson's work is bound up with one of the most significant events of 1957, the launch of Sputnik 1 on 4 October 1957, and the tale of Farnborough's involvement is told in detail by one of the key participants, Desmond King-Hele, in his book *A Tapestry of Orbits* [21]. The short version is that with the aid of a large radio antenna hastily erected in a nearby field, and some calculations of

[1] Flight-related research at Farnborough began with the Army Balloon Factory in 1904, which became the Royal Aircraft Factory in 1912, the Royal Aircraft Establishment in 1918, and then the Royal Aerospace Establishment in 1988. It was merged into the Defence Research Agency in 1991 and then into the Defence Evaluation and Research Agency in 1995. This was split up in 2001, with the Farnborough part becoming part of the private company Qinetiq. Desmond King-Hele's version of these later developments is recorded at [22].



Figure 1: Merson's [25] 1957 diagram of rooted trees representing elementary differentials, and (bottom) an example of a product of trees, in this case the pre-Lie product explained in Section 2.



Figure 2: Cayley's [10] 1857 diagram of rooted trees representing elementary differentials.

Robin Merson, within two weeks they had an accurate orbit for Sputnik 1. This allowed them to estimate the density of the upper atmosphere and (after Sputnik 2) the shape of the earth. Robin Merson became an expert in practical numerical analysis and orbit determination.

Merson's paper explains clearly the structure of the elementary differentials $f'(f)$, $f''(f,f)$ and so on, and, crucially, shows how they are in one-to-one correspondence with rooted trees. He also introduces various basic operations on rooted trees. This development, perhaps regarded initially as a bookkeeping device for finding and keeping track of the different terms, has over time become central to the combinatorial and algebraic study of B-series.

The rooted trees $\mathcal{T}$ and their associated elementary differentials $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T})$ are

$$\mathcal{T} = \Big\{\emptyset, \bullet, \ , \ , \ ,

a purely abstract structure and 17 years later—behold the power of mathematics!—found that he could use them to count molecules. However, another way to read these events is that Cayley needed trees for *exactly* the purpose we are using them here—to keep track of how vector fields interact when applied repeatedly to one another—and this purpose was then forgotten for a hundred years. The need for better numerical integration methods arose quite soon, towards the end of the 19th century, and the required tools for a complete theory were already present, but they had been forgotten.

As Frank Harary wrote [18],

> *In very many cases and in disciplines in the physical sciences, the social sciences, computer science, and the humanities, graphs frequently occur as a natural, useful, and intuitive mathematical model. The consequence is that those investigators who were not aware of the existence of graph theory as a study in its own right were led to rediscover it in order to apply it.*

Interestingly enough, Merson does cite Cayley. However, from the context, it is not clear that he actually laid eyes on Cayley's paper. He writes,

> *A formula for the number of trees of a given order was discovered by CAYLEY* [our [10]] and quoted by ROUSE–BALL...

This was probably the original 1892 edition of Rouse Ball's famous book *Mathematical Recreations and Essays*, as later editions included Coxeter as coauthor. This first edition contains just one page on trees, stating Cayley's formulae for the number of trees. Now this same section of Rouse Ball also discusses the famous Knight's Tour problem, an astonishingly long-lived problem dating from an Arabic manuscript of 840 AD. For example, there were three articles on Knight's Tours published in the *Mathematical Gazette* in 1956 alone. This problem became a life-long interest of Merson's, who published tours in 1974 and 1999 (posthumously, in *Games and Puzzles* magazine, from letters written in 1990–91) that are still in many cases the best known tours. Although Merson stated [20] that he first became interested in the problem in 1972, it is not unlikely that in 1957 he rediscovered trees independently because, like Cayley, he needed them, and from his interest in recreational mathematics remembered Rouse Ball's discussion of Cayley without ever chasing it up.

John Butcher, at that time a PhD student in physics at the University of Sydney, was actually present at Robin Merson's talk in 1957, but says [4] that he did not understand it at all. However, the seed was planted there. To return to Butcher's 1963 paper, he closes with the following statement:

> *It happens that this situation is capable of extensive generalization and, for example, keeping this same value $\nu = 3$ it is possible to satisfy the 37 conditions necessary for a sixth order process. Similarly for any value of ν a process of order up to 2ν is possible. It is intended that details of such processes will be discussed in a later publication.*

This was an announcement of Butcher's discovery of the family of Gauss Runge–Kutta methods and the first hint of extra structure contained within the Runge–Kutta order conditions. Methods with 3 stages have 12 free parameters (a_{ij} and b_j for $i, j = 1, 2, 3$) and Butcher was extremely excited to discover that there were values of the parameters that satisfied not just the 8 conditions for order 4, and the 17 conditions required for order 5, but even the 37 conditions required for order 6! He recalls running through the empty corridors of the mathematics department at the University of Canterbury, where

he was then lecturing, desperately trying to find someone to understand and to share the excitement [4]. He fulfilled his intention to publish the details in his very next paper [6].

One approach taken by Butcher to approach the structure of the order conditions, suggested by this discovery, was to introduce certain *simplifying assumptions*. These became the cornerstone of the construction of the efficient high-order explicit integrators that are used today. However, the algebraic structure of these simplifying assumptions themselves remained mysterious; only very recently has their algebraic origin been explained [23]. This has allowed them to be embedded in systematic families and further reduced the number of stages needed at high order. We take this as further evidence that after 50 years Butcher's vision is alive and well.

This initial intensely creative and productive period came to a head with the publication of *An algebraic theory of integration methods* in 1972 [7]—submitted in 1968—in which John Butcher introduced what is now called the Butcher group. The B-series (1) with $c_0 = 1$ correspond formally to diffeomorphisms close to the flow of f, and the Butcher group operation is a product of rooted trees that corresponds to the composition of these diffeomorphisms.

Many areas of inquiry show a tendency to divide adherents into 'lumpers' and 'splitters'. For example, in taxonomy, lumpers prefer to name few species, splitters many. Lumpers emphasize similarity, splitters emphasize difference. Numerical analysis, like most parts of mathematics, shows a gradual tendency over time towards splitting, as the true differences between instances are appreciated and exploited. Thus structure-preserving methods have been developed for finer and finer divisions of matrices, differential equations and so on, that, by restricting the problem class, are able to offer superior performance. Iserles [19] alludes to this when he compares ordinary differential equations to Tolstoy's happy families, that ('perhaps', Iserles cautions) all resemble each other, while each partial differential equation is unhappy in its own way. Indeed, a mighty strength, and also a potential weakness, of Runge–Kutta methods and of B-series is that they treat *all* ODEs in a uniform way. They are an extreme example of lumping. One might wonder if they are perhaps *too* extreme. Do they over-lump ODEs?

In our view they have held up pretty well. The first widely-acknowledged division of ODEs in numerical analysis was into stiff and nonstiff equations. Implicit Runge–Kutta methods turned out to be ideal for stiff equations and explicit ones for nonstiff. With the advent of symplectic integrators for Hamiltonian systems, that preserve a quadratic conservation law on first variations of solutions, Runge–Kutta methods were found to be suitable too. New classes of methods have been introduced that have features that Runge–Kutta methods do not, such as exponential integrators like

$$x_{n+1} = x_n + \phi(hf'(x_n))hf(x_n), \quad \phi(z) = \frac{e^z - 1}{z},$$

which can beat implicit Runge–Kutta methods on some stiff equations, and the AVF (Average Vector Field) method

$$x_{n+1} = x_n + \int_0^1 f(\xi x_{n+1} + (1-\xi)x_n)\,\mathrm{d}\xi$$

that preserves energy $H(x)$ when $f = J^{-1}\nabla H$ is a Hamiltonian vector field. Both (1) and (1) have expansions in B-series.

On the other hand, some methods such as the leapfrog or Störmer–Verlet method, widely used in molecular dynamics and in video game engines for systems of the form $\ddot{x} = -\nabla V(x)$, do not have B-series—indeed they are not even defined for all first order

systems $\dot{x} = f(x)$—and should certainly not be discarded on that account. Our view is *lump if you can, but split if you must.*

In fact some would say that there is *no* practical reason for preferring methods with a B-series and that the whole concept is merely a mathematical abstraction or (perhaps) convenience. However, note that (1) lumps not only ODEs, but also numerical methods. A very large class of numerical methods for ODEs are represented by (1). Even before getting to the question of what the possession of a B-series confers on a numerical method, the lumping of numerical methods by B-series presents a fairly rare opportunity in computational science. All too often one analyzes the complexity or behaviour of a *particular* algorithm, or perhaps of a small class. Meaningful lower bounds for complexity or behaviour over *all* algorithms are almost never obtained. One should not miss the opportunity given by B-Series to better understand an infinite-dimensional set of methods, without regard to particular details of the method.

Several times, new numerical methods have been reflected in the discovery of new structure within B-series. For example, if $f = J^{-1}\nabla H$ for some H and J, where $J^T = -J$ defines a symplectic structure on the vector space V, then f is Hamiltonian and energy preserving and we can ask which B-series have these properties. The trivial B-series $B(f) = c_1 f$ are the only ones which are both Hamiltonian and energy-preserving. At first sight it is surprising that the first nontrivial B-series, $f'f$, is neither Hamiltonian nor energy-preserving. At the next order, $f'f'f$ is energy preserving and $f''(f,f) - 2f'f'f$ is Hamiltonian. The spaces of such B-series have been completely described [12].

2 Algebraic characterizations

The topic of B-series can be approached from many different points of view; topics in numerical analysis, geometry and abstract algebra are connected via B-series. The fundamental algebraic structure of a *pre-Lie algebra* unifies three seemingly very different papers all written in 1963: John Butcher's first paper on Runge–Kutta methods [5], Ernest Vinberg's paper on the geometry of symmetric cones [28] and Murray Gerstenhaber's work on homology and deformations of algebras [15]. The differential geometric picture starts with the basic notion of parallel transport of vectors, which is infinitesimally described in terms of a *connection* or *covariant derivation* of vector fields. The connection is a bilinear operation of vector fields $(f,g) \mapsto f \triangleright g$ (often written as $\nabla_f g$) which describes the rate of change of g as it is parallel-transported along the flow of f. On the vector space $\mathbb{R}^n$ parallel transport is the obvious rule, and the corresponding connection is given as

$$f \triangleright g = g'(f) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial g^i}{\partial x_j} f^j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}.$$

The curvature R and the torsion T are the two basic invariants of a connection. On flat spaces, such as the above defined connection on $\mathbb{R}^n$, both $R = 0$ and $T = 0$. It can be shown that in this case the connection satisfies the following *pre-Lie* relation:

$$f \triangleright (g \triangleright h) - (f \triangleright g) \triangleright h = g \triangleright (f \triangleright h) - (g \triangleright f) \triangleright h.$$

An algebra with a product satisfying this relationship is called a *pre-Lie algebra*. So, the set of smooth vector fields on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the standard connection is an example of a pre-Lie algebra[2]. Another example is the linear combination of rooted trees, where the pre-Lie

[2] Also called a Vinberg, Koszul–Vinberg, left-symmetric, or Gerstenhaber algebra. The name reflects the fact that the skew product $[x,y] := x \triangleright y - y \triangleright x$ defines a Lie bracket. However it should be noted that the pre-Lie relation is not the most general form of a product with this property.

product is given by grafting: for two trees τ_1 and τ_2 the pre-Lie product $\tau_1 \triangleright \tau_2$ is computed by attaching the root of τ_1 with an edge to each of the nodes of τ_2 and adding all these terms together (see Figure 1.) The pre-Lie algebra perspective of B-series was promoted by Calaque, Ebrahimi-Fard, and Manchon [8]. A fundamental result, which was essentially known already to Cayley in 1857, but which has been revisited in a modern algebraic setting by Chapoton and Livernet in 2001 [11], is that the space of all trees with the grafting product is the *free pre-Lie algebra*. This means that this structure 'knows all there is to know' about basic algebraic properties of pre-Lie algebras, and any algebraic computation which relies only on the pre-Lie relationship can be expressed as a computation on trees. It also means that any example of a concrete pre-Lie algebra can be realised as a quotient of the free pre-Lie algebra with some ideal (that is, as trees with some equivalence relation). This is indeed a useful result for computations.

The correspondence between abstract trees and concrete elements in a given pre-Lie algebra (e.g., a vector field on $\mathbb{R}^n$) is exactly the elementary differential map of Butcher. The elementary differential map $\mathcal{F}(\tau)$, taking trees to vector fields, respects the structure of the pre-Lie product, $\mathcal{F}(\tau_1 \triangleright \tau_2) = \mathcal{F}(\tau_1) \triangleright \mathcal{F}(\tau_2)$, where the triangle on the left is grafting of trees and on the right is the covariant derivative of vector fields. All the elementary differentials are obtained this way. For example, since $= \bullet \triangleright (\bullet \triangleright \bullet) - (\bullet \triangleright \bullet) \triangleright \bullet$, we must have that if $\mathcal{F}(\bullet) = f$, then $\mathcal{F}($$) = f \triangleright (f \triangleright f) - (f \triangleright f) \triangleright f$. Similarly, all the terms of the B-series can be expressed in terms of the pre-Lie product, and hence we can regard a B-series as an infinite expansion in a pre-Lie product.

Are there other important examples of pre-Lie algebras where B-series might play a role? There was a great surprise in the late 1990s when Christian Brouder pointed out [2] that the so-called Hopf algebra of Alain Connes and Dirk Kreimer [13] had the same algebraic structure that John Butcher had been studying in detail in his 1972 paper. Connes and Kreimer had been interested in renormalisation processes in quantum field theory and discovered a rich algebraic structure of trees. After Brouder's remark the Fields medallist Alain Connes wrote [13] *"We regard Butcher's work on the classification of numerical integration methods as an impressive example that concrete problem-oriented work can lead to far-reaching conceptual results."* Pierre Cartier [9] has also written a very clear exposition of the significance of pre-Lie algebras and the algebraic origin of the Connes–Kreimer approach.

More recently these algebraic structures appear in other important areas, such as in stochastic processes, where the *Rough Paths Theory* gives a precise meaning to integrating functions along highly irregular paths. This theory originated from the work of Terry Lyons and was celebrated by the Fields medal awarded to Martin Hairer in 2014 for his work on regularity structures. Relations between rough paths and B-series have been developed in the work of Massimo Gubinelli [16].

In a completely different direction, expansions in rooted trees can be used to dramatically simplify and also to sharpen known results in complex dynamics [14] (*"this amounts to a novel approach to formal linearization by means of a powerful and elegant combinatorial machinery"*).

Considering B-series as an expansion in a (flat and torsion free) connection, we may ask what are the characterising geometric properties of a B-series? A partial answer comes from the question of which invertible mappings $\phi\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ preserve the connection $\triangleright$. Let ϕ act on vector fields in the 'natural' way (i.e., as a differential equation transforms under change of coordinates) $\phi \cdot f := (\phi') \circ f \circ \phi^{-1}$, where ϕ' is the Jacobian matrix. Then it can be shown that $\phi \cdot (f \triangleright g) = (\phi \cdot f) \triangleright (\phi \cdot g)$ for all vector fields f and g if and only if $\phi(x) = Ax + b$ is an affine map. However, it turns out that this condition is not enough

to nail precisely the question of *What is a B-series?*, but we shall see that it brings us a long way towards the answer. Before we explore this issue further in the next section, we remark on other recent geometric developments of the theory.

Concerning the group structure of B-series, Bogfjellmo and Schmeding [1] proved that the space of B-series is an infinite-dimensional Lie group with respect to a natural Fréchet topology. Among numerical analysts, B-series have long been treated as Lie groups without a rigorous justification; the result by Bogfjellmo and Schmeding resolves this and unveils interesting possibilities to apply tools from infinite-dimensional geometry to the backward error analysis of ODE methods.

The question of characterising geometries by invariance properties goes a long time back to the 19'th century work of Felix Klein, who in his *Erlangen program* of 1872 raised fundamental questions about geometries and symmetries. An example is the study of affine geometries as a generalisation of Euclidean spaces. In this geometric context it is interesting to ask if other geometries have algebras describing their connections, such as pre-Lie algebras for affine geometries. Recent developments have shown that this is indeed the case. For Lie groups and homogeneous spaces there are naturally defined connections which give rise to *post-Lie* algebras, and from this we obtain B-series types of expansions valid for flows evolving on manifolds ('Lie–Butcher' series) [26]. Yet another algebra appears in the context of symmetric spaces such as, for example, spheres and Riemannian spaces with constant curvature. This is an active area of research, where differential geometry, algebraic combinatorics, differential equations, computations and applications go hand-in-hand.

Thus, the study of Butcher series is very definitely alive 50 years after their discovery. Recently we have established a characterization of Butcher series that, at least to our minds, answers the title question, *What are Butcher series, really?*

3 Geometric characterizations

The usual construction of Butcher series, as carried out for example in [17], starts by defining the rooted trees, mostly easily done recursively using the operation of adding a root to a forest (set of rooted trees). Then the elementary differentials are defined and associated to the rooted trees, and finally it is shown that various objects (flows, Runge–Kutta and other integration methods) can be expanded in Butcher series. *This is completely backwards.* It is analogous to defining the prime numbers as an infinite set (e.g. $\cap_{n\geq 2}\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 2} \setminus n\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 2}$) and only later proving that its elements are prime—only in our case, we don't know the meaning of 'prime'. Why do exactly these particular combinations, $f''(f,f)$ and so on, keep coming up? What is special about them?

A crucial clue is provided in the definition of Runge–Kutta methods, (1). These involve only the evaluation of f, scalar multiplication, and addition—the defining operations of the vector space V. This suggests that Runge–Kutta methods are defined intrinsically on V and do not depend on the choice of basis. Indeed, as already mentioned previously in the context of pre-Lie algebras, slightly more is true: Runge–Kutta methods (and B-series) are *affine-equivariant*. Indeed, let, as before, smooth invertible mappings $\phi\colon V \to V$ act on the vector space V and on vector fields on V in the natural way. Then B-series with $c_0 = 1$, such as the expansions of numerical integrators, obey

$$\phi \cdot B(c,f) = B(c, \phi \cdot f)$$

for all invertible affine maps $\phi(x) = Ax + b$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $\det A \neq 0$. Could it be the case that any affine-equivariant method has a Butcher series? In other words, does affine-equivariance

n	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
# rooted trees	1	1	2	4	9	20	48	115	286	719
# aromatic trees	1	2	6	16	45	121	338	929	2598	7261

Table 1: Enumeration of rooted and aromatic trees with up to 10 nodes.

characterize B-series methods?

In [27], two of us showed that this is not the case. There are many methods that are affine-equivariant but do not have Butcher series. They show that affine-equivariant methods can be expanded in terms of more general objects, the *aromatic series*. Combinatorically, these are represented by 'aromatic trees', forests consisting of one rooted tree and any number of directed graphs with one cycle (self-loops allowed). The name is suggested by aromatic compounds, such as benzene, that contain cycles of atoms. An aromatic series begins

$$\begin{aligned} & c_0 x + c_1 hf \\ & \quad + h^2(c_2 f'f + c_3 f\nabla \cdot f) \\ & \quad + h^3(c_4 f''(f,f) + c_5 f'f'f + c_6 f(f\cdot\nabla(\nabla\cdot f)) + c_7 f'f\nabla\cdot f \\ & \qquad + c_8 f(\nabla\cdot f)^2 + c_9 f\,\mathrm{tr}(f'^2)) \\ & \quad + \cdots \end{aligned}$$

which may be represented as an element in the span of the aromatic trees



There are clearly many more aromatic than rooted trees. The aromatic trees of order n are in 1–1 correspondence with functions from $\{2,\dots,n\}$ to $\{1,\dots,n\}$, 'forgetting the labels', that is, modulo permutations of $\{2,\dots,n\}$. (Here the element 1 identifies the root.) For example, the aromatic tree



is associated with the function $2\mapsto 1$, $3\mapsto 4$, $4\mapsto 4$ and with the (generalized) elementary differential

$$\sum_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4=1}^{n} f^{i_1}_{i_2} f^{i_2} f^{i_3} f^{i_4}_{i_3 i_4} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_1}} = f'(f)\,(f\cdot\nabla(\nabla\cdot f)).$$

The numbers of such 'shapes of partially defined functions' is given in sequence A126285 in the Online Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences and tabulated in Table 1. The number of rooted trees, first evaluated by Cayley, are shown for comparison. The apparently terrifying numbers of rooted trees were tamed by Butcher. What will happen to the even more plentiful aromatic trees?

The existence of the aromatic series shows that affine-equivariance of a method is not enough to ensure that it can be expanded in a B-series. What else is needed? The second

big clue is that Runge–Kutta methods are defined without reference to the dimension of the underlying vector space. It does not seem to play any role at all. Clearly, at a minimum, the expansion of the method in each dimension must have the same coefficients. But what rules out the aromatic terms like $f\nabla \cdot f$?

The answer is that these terms do not respect *affine-relatedness*. Consider two vector spaces V and W of possibly different dimension, together with an affine map $\phi\colon V \to W$, $x \mapsto Ax + b$. The vector fields f on V and g on W are said to be ϕ-related if $g(Ax + b) = Af(x)$ for for all $x \in V$. B-series preserve affine-relatedness in the sense that for any affine ϕ, if f and g are ϕ-related then $B(c, f)$ is ϕ-related to $B(c, g)$. In [24] we prove that this property characterizes B-series: *a numerical method has a Butcher series if and only if it preserves affine-relatedness.*

Preserving affine-relatedness has a fairly direct physical interpretation. It means that the method is immune to changes of scale, such as changes of units. It means that the method preserves invariant affine subspaces *automatically*, whenever the system has any such. It means that the method preserves affine symmetries, again automatically; the method does not even have to 'know' (or be told) that the system has the symmetries. It means that the method leaves decoupled systems decoupled, again automatically. All these properties are desirable when designing general-purpose ODE software.

So, to summarize, Butcher series are objects intrinsically associated to the set of vector fields on vector (properly, affine) spaces of *all* dimensions, and will show up naturally in any analysis that does not depend on the dimension. This, to some extent, explains their ubiquity.

On the other hand, where does this leave the aromatic series? We suggest that they will show up naturally in problems posed in a specific dimension. Although traces are common in physics, we have not seen aromatic series before. They arose purely from a question in numerical analysis, but are fundamental in their own way. Moreover, they can have properties that no B-series can have: many aromatic series, but no B-series, are divergence free.

References

[1] Bogfjellmo, G. and Schmeding, A., The Lie Group Structure of the Butcher Group, *Found. Comp. Math.* (2015), DOI:10.1007/s10208-015-9285-5

[2] Brouder, C., Runge–Kutta methods and renormalization, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **12** (2000),521–534.

[3] http://jcbutcher.com/publications

[4] Butcher, J. C., personal communication.

[5] Butcher, J.C., Coefficients for the study of Runge-Kutta integration processes, *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* **3** (1963), 185–201.

[6] Butcher, J.C., Implicit Runge-Kutta processes, *Math. Comp.* **18** (1964), 50–64.

[7] Butcher, J.C., An algebraic theory of integration methods, *Math. Comp.* **26** (1972), 79–106.

[8] Calaque, D., Ebrahimi-Fard, K., and Manchon, D., Two interacting Hopf algebras of trees: A Hopf-algebraic approach to composition and substitution of B-series, *Adv. Appl. Math.* **47** (2011), 282–308.

[9] Cartier, P., Vinberg algebras, Lie groups and combinatorics, in *Clay Mathematics Proceedings. Quanta of Maths* **11** (2010), 107–126.

[10] Cayley, A., On the theory of the analytical forms called trees, *Philos. Mag.* **13**(85) (1857), 172–176.

[11] Chapoton, F. and Livernet, M, Pre-Lie algebras and the rooted trees operad, *International Mathematics Research Notices* **8** (2001), 395–408.

[12] Celledoni, E., McLachlan, R. I., Owren, B. and Quispel, G. R. W., Energy-preserving integrators and the structure of B-series, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* **10** (2010), 673–693.

[13] Connes, A. and Kreimer, D., Lessons from quantum field theory: Hopf algebras and spacetime geometries. *Letters in Mathematical Physics* **48** (1999), 85–96.

[14] Fauvet, F., Menous, F. and Sauzin, D., Explicit linearization of one-dimensional germs through tree-expansions, preprint, 2014.

[15] Gerstenhaber, M., The cohomology structure of an associative ring, *Ann. Math.* **78** (1963), 267–288.

[16] Gubinelli, M., Ramification of rough paths, *Journal of Differential Equations* **248** (2010), 693–721.

[17] Hairer, E., Lubich, C., and Wanner, G., *Geometric numerical integration: structure-preserving algorithms for ordinary differential equations*, 2nd ed., Springer, Berlin, 2006.

[18] Harary, F., Independent discoveries in graph theory, *Ann. New York Acad. Sci.* **328** (1979), 1–4.

[19] Iserles, A., *A first course in the numerical analysis of differential equations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009.

[20] Jelliss, G. P., Knight's Tour notes, http://www.mayhematics.com/t/2n.htm.

[21] King-Hele, D., *A tapestry of orbits*, Cambridge University Press, 2005.

[22] King-Hele, D., The destruction of the Royal Aircraft Establishment, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E0fSLiAa9Zw.

[23] Khashin, S, Butcher algebras for Butcher systems, *Numer. Alg.* **63** (2013), 679–689.

[24] McLachlan, R. I., Modin, K., Munthe-Kaas, H., and Verdier, O., B–series are exactly the affine-equivariant methods, *Numer. Math.* (2015), pp. 1–24.

[25] Merson, R. H., An operational method for the study of integration processes, in *Proceedings of Conference on Data Processing and Automatic Computing Machines vol. 1*, Weapons Research Establishment, Salisbury, South Australia, 1957, pp. 1–25.

[26] Munthe-Kaas, H. Z. and Lundervold, A., On post-Lie algebras, Lie–Butcher series and moving frames. *Found. Comp. Math.* **13** (2013), 583–613.

[27] Munthe-Kaas, H. and Verdier, O. (2015). Aromatic Butcher series. *Found. Comp. Math.* **16** (2016), 183–215.

[28] Vinberg, E. B., The theory of convex homogeneous cones, *Trans. Moscow Math. Soc.* **12** (1963), 340–403.